

Continue Court (1998)

Me. Thurs it is a Worden of the property of the control of the con

Buy Mary Province Company of

On the second of the second of

Confidence of Senierous services in a consequent of the senies of the services of the senies of the

Inthe Supreme Court of the Cinited States

OCTOBER TERM, 1943

No. 159

MRS. EULA MAY WALTON, ADMINISTRATRIN OF THE ESTATE OF FRED-WALTON, DECEASED, PETITIONER

SOUTHERN PACKAGE CORPORATION

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF MISSISSIPPI

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AS AMICUS CURIAE

This suit was brought to recover overtime compensation, liquidated damages, and attorney's fees under the Fair Labor Standard Act. The employee was a night watchman in a plant engaged in the manufacture of lumber and vencer products, a substantial portion of which was shipped in interstate commerce. The court below reversed a judgment for the employee on the ground that he was not engaged in an occupation necessary to the

production of goods for interstate commerce. 11 So. (2d) 912.

The decision below is in direct conflict with this Court's decision in Kirschbann Co. v. Welling, 316 U. S. 517, and, unless this Court should desire to determine the other questions raised by respondent, should, it is submitted, be reversed and, remanded on the petition for certificari without argument. The court below refers at some length to the opinion of this Court in the Kirschbaum ease and appears to reject its reasoning. 411 So. (2d), at 917-918). Its decision, however, is placed upon the supposed distinction that in this C case a night watchman was involved, whereas in other cases holding-watchmen covered, they "were in each instance, almost without exception, at least on duty while such goods were being produced. or were employed specially to guard the goods while awaiting shipment" (11 So. (2d), at 918). The record and this Court's opinion in Kirschbaum negate any such distinction. The employees involved in Kirschbaum included a night watchman .(Kirschbaum record, p. 63). In describing their duties the Court said, "The watchmen protect the buildings from fire and theft" (316 U.S., at 519). Coverage was predicated upon the

Respondent has also raised questions as to the survivorship of the cause of action and the statute of limitations, but the court below found it unnecessary to pass upon these points. This memorandism is concernal with with the question of coverage.

theory that "maintenance of a safe, habitable building is indispensable to" the production of goods for interstate commerce (316 U.S., at 524). The facts of the instant case fall squarely within this rationale. The watchman was employed "for the purpose of reporting any fires, and trespassers" (11 So. (2d), at 912). And even if his duties related only to the protection of the plant rather than the goods produced (11-So. (2d), at 915), he was engaged in maintaining a building so that production could be carried on.2 . The fact that this protection is afforded at night, when the need for it may be greater, is hardly a basis for denving coverage. Cf. Bowie v. Gonzales, 117 F. (2d) 11, 20 (C. C. A. 1), where employees engaged in repair and maintenance of sugar mills in the dead season were held covered.

. Respectfully submitted.



CHARLES FAHY, Solicitor General.

Douglas B. Mages, Solicitor,

IRVING J. LEVY, ~

Associate Solicitor,

United States Department of Labor.

SEPTEMBER 1943.

In the Kirschhaum case, the watchman was the employee of the owner of the building, not of an employer producing for commerce. In the second case, portioner's employer itself manufactures and slaps in interstate commerce.